

### **REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-6 and 13-23 are presently active in this case. The present Amendment amends Claims 1, 3-6 and 13-14, and adds new Claims 15-23 without introducing any new matter.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 3-7 and 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Alperovich (U.S. Patent No. 6,175,741) in view of Klausner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,572,576, herein "Klausner"), and in further view of Bodnar et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0211864, herein "Bodnar"). Claims 2 and 8-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Alperovich, Klausner and Bodnar in further view of Peacock et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,601,111, herein "Peacock").

To clarify Applicant's invention, independent Claim 1 is amended to recite "a digital cellular telephone set including a wireless communication link and a cellular network communication link." These features find non-limiting support in the disclosure as originally filed, for example from page 7, line 7, to page 9, line 2, and in Figures 1 and 3, reference numerals 29 and 30. Independent Claims 3-7 and 13-15 are amended with features analogous to the features of amended Claim 1.

To vary the scope of protection recited in the claims, new Claims 15-23 are added. New Claims 15 and 16 depend upon Claims 1 and 4, respectively, and recite that "said wireless communication link is a BLUETOOTH interface and said information processing apparatus is a personal computer (PC)."<sup>1</sup> New Claims 17-23 depend upon Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 13 and 14, respectively, and recite features regarding displaying a summary of said personal information. These features were previously introduced to the independent claims

---

<sup>1</sup> Finds non-limiting support in Applicant's Specification as originally filed, for example at page 5, lines 3-19.

by the June 22, 2004 Amendment, and are herewith presented in dependent Claims 17-23.<sup>2</sup>

Accordingly, these features are deleted from independent Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 13 and 14.

Since the new claims find non-limiting support in the disclosure as originally filed, they are not believed to raise a question of new matter.<sup>3</sup>

In response to the rejection of Claims 1, 3-7 and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection and traverses the rejection, as discussed next.

Briefly recapitulating, Applicant's Claim 1 relates to an information processing system including: a digital cellular telephone set including a wireless communication link and a cellular network communication link, configured to transmit via a the wireless communication link a caller number specific to a caller, said caller number previously added to an incoming wireless signal via the cellular network communication link from a base station; and an information processing apparatus configured to receive said caller number transmitted by said digital cellular telephone set via the wireless communication link, configured to read personal information on said caller associated with said caller number from a storage means, and configured to display the information.

Applicant respectfully submits that all the references used by the outstanding Office Action to form a 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection, Alperovich, Klausner and Bodnar, fail to teach or suggest a digital cellular telephone set including *a wireless communication link* and a cellular network communication link, configured to *transmit via the wireless communication link a caller number specific to a caller*, as recited in Applicant's Claim 1, as next discussed.

Turning now to the applied references, Alperovich describes a telecommunication method to enhance business card services, wherein a business card associated with the mobile

---

<sup>2</sup> Idem from page 15, line 24 to page 17, line 9.

<sup>3</sup> See MPEP 2163.06 stating that "information contained in any one of the specification, claims or drawings of the application as filed may be added to any other part of the application without introducing new matter."

subscriber is stored in the mobile terminal 20a of the cellular network, and can be sent through the cellular network to another a mobile terminal 20b.<sup>4</sup> However, Alperovich fails to teach or suggest a digital cellular telephone set including a wireless communication link and a cellular network communication link, configured to transmit via the wireless communication link a caller number specific to a caller, said caller number previously added to an incoming wireless signal via the cellular network communication link from a base station. Applicant's digital cellular phone includes a wireless communication link and a cellular network communication link, both links are not disclosed by Alperovich. Alperovich further states "[t]his business card information can be transmitted by a business card application within the MS through the cellular network to another MS that has the business card application for receiving, storing, sorting and displaying the information."<sup>5</sup> In other words, Alperovich sends a text message with caller information from one terminal 20a to another terminal 20b through at least the base transceiver station BTS 24.<sup>6</sup> As further specified in Applicant's dependent Claim 15, the wireless communication link is a bluetooth interface and said information processing apparatus is a personal computer, and Alperovich is entirely silent on such features.

The reference Klausner discloses a telephone answering device that can decode DTMF signals so as to display identity of callers, however, Klausner is also silent on the features regarding the digital cellular telephone set including a wireless communication link and a cellular network communication link.

The reference Bodnar describes a companion digital organizer CDO associated with a mobile phone, wherein the CDO communicates with the mobile phone by a wired serial port 60.<sup>7</sup> Accordingly, Bodnar also fails to teach or suggest the digital cellular telephone set

---

<sup>4</sup> See Alperovich in the Abstract and in Figure 2.

<sup>5</sup> See Alperovich at column 2, lines 57-61.

<sup>6</sup> See Alperovich in Figure 1.

<sup>7</sup> See Bodnar in the Abstract, and at page 3, paragraph 29, lines 3-18.

including a wireless communication link and a cellular network communication link.

Bodnar's CDO is further able to "(1) instruct the host phone to allow the CDO to receive incoming-phone-call (e.g., "telephone ring") signals; (2) decipher caller-ID information provided by the telephone service provider in the incoming-phone-call signal to identify the caller's phone number."<sup>8</sup> However, caller-ID information provided by the telephone service provider in the incoming-phone-call signal to identify the caller's phone number, as taught by Bodnar, *is not* a digital cellular telephone configured to *transit a caller number* specific to a caller, and instructing the host phone to allow the CDO to receive incoming-phone-call, as taught by Bodnar, *is not* receiving the caller number by an information processing apparatus, as recited Applicant's Claim 1,

Therefore, even if the combination of Alperovich, Klausner and Bodnar is assumed to be proper, the combination fails to teach every element of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses, and requests reconsideration of, this rejection based on these patents.<sup>9</sup>

Independent Claims 3-6 and 13-14 recite limitations analogous to the limitations recited in independent Claim 1. Moreover, Claims 3-6 and 13-14 have been amended in a manner analogous to the amendment to Claim 1. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above for the patentability of Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of Claims 3-6 and 13-14, are rendered moot by the present amendment to Claims 3-6 and 13-14.

In response to the rejection of Claims 2 and 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), since Claims 2 and 8-11 were cancelled in the Amendment filed January 26, 2005, no rejection of Claims 2 and 8-11 can be formed. In the present Application, Claims 1 and 8-11 are not pending. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

---

<sup>8</sup> See Bodnar at page 7, paragraph 76.

<sup>9</sup> See MPEP 2142 stating, as one of the three "basic criteria [that] must be met" in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, that "the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations," (emphasis added). See also MPEP 2143.03: "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art."


The present amendment is submitted in accordance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.116, which after Final Rejection permits entry of amendments placing the claims in better form for consideration on appeal. As the present amendment is believed to overcome outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the present amendment places the application in better form for consideration on appeal. In addition, the present amendment is not believed to raise new issues because the changes to Claims 1, 3-6 and 13-14 are of a minor nature and are done for clarification purposes only. It is therefore respectfully requested that 37 C.F.R. §1.116 be liberally construed, and that the present amendment be entered.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1, 3-6 and 13-23 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

\\ATTY\NS\06541\275740US\275740US.AM1-DRAFT1.DOC